



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

work. In his argument to show that there is always a difference between the absolute gerund and the present participle, Weisweiler is more successful. In the last chapter he tries to show that in all cases where this participle is used, there is a distinct reference to future time, more or less vivid, or more exactly to an action to be accomplished, whether this accomplishment actually occurs or not. In this we think he is quite successful, and we quote his last paragraph. "So liegt auch jenen Variationen des 'Sollens' in den verschiedenen Gebrauchsweisen des Verbaladjektivs auf *-ndus* im Lateinischen ein allgemeiner, 'noch unentfalteter Begriff des Müssens' zu Grunde, *der Begriff der zu vollziehenden Thätigkeit*. Nur die Anerkennung dieser Auffassung der Verbalhandlung ermöglicht zugleich die rechte Einsicht in die mannigfaltige *syntaktische Verwendung* jener Verbalform und in der Sinn der Bezeichnungen *gerundium* und *participium futuri passivi*." The book may be pronounced a most interesting and stimulating contribution to the literature of this participle, although we by no means believe that the last word has yet been said on this subject.

SAMUEL BALL PLATNER.

Noctes Manilianae sive dissertationes in Astronomica Manilii. Accedunt, Coniecturae in Germanici Aratea. Scripsit R. ELLIS. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1891. 255 pp.

Robinson Ellis has a remarkable fondness for difficult and neglected authors. In calling attention to Manilius he has added one more to the many services already rendered by him to scholarship. One is almost tempted to paraphrase the title of his latest work by 'the dark passages of Manilius,' for doing which a certain justification might be found in the *Ibis*, v. 63:

Utque mei versus aliquantum noctis habebunt.

Occasional flashes of genius Manilius has, but they do not illumine his whole poem. His muse rarely leaves the earth to soar among the stars, although the stars form his subject. There are a few lines which haunt the memory and which claim a place for themselves beside Lucretius, to whom, however, Manilius is as inferior in poetic fire as he is in sustained enthusiasm. Recent criticism has shown that the last editor, Jacob (1846), erred in attaching supreme importance to Vossianus II, a Leyden MS of the year 1470. A Brussels MS, the Gemblacensis, of the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century, now claims the first rank, and Ellis, differing from Bechert, shows that the Vossianus II comes next, while the Lipsiensis, Cusanus, and other MSS must occasionally be appealed to, to establish the correct reading. Ellis himself adds many readings from a Bodleian and a Corpus Christi MS, and has collated anew both the Vossiani. In his attempts to restore the text he is for the most part conservative, and, in striking contrast to Bentley, aims to adhere to the ductus litterarum. It would be impossible within the limits of this notice even to glance at the scores of passages on which Ellis has thrown new light, either by a clear recognition of the difficulties in the existent text, a better interpretation, or an improved reading. Much obscurity, of course, remains and will remain, and not all of the arguments advanced carry conviction.

Perhaps Ellis would not have introduced *coniunctim* for *commentum* in Bk. I 84, nor *contextim* in I 756, if he had noticed that Manilius is not fond of adverbs in *-im*, only using, if my observation is correct, the common adverbs *passim* and *cursum* and *vicissim* with *paulatim* and *generatim*. In I 245 Ellis reads with Conington

nos in nocte sumus somnosque in membra vocamus.

for *locamus*. This line Bentley thought spurious. There is a great temptation to adopt *vocamus*, but Vergil, A. X 867, has *locare membra*, and Horace, S. II 2, 81, *sopori membra dare*. May we not then, assuming anastrophe, connect *in* with *somnos*? Compare 'Now I lay me down to sleep.' Cramer, 'de Manilii Elocutione,' p. 45, gives some examples of anastrophe after *que*. See Manilius, V 144, *perque dapes mensasque super*, where the preposition, to be sure, is disyllabic. In I 751 I should prefer to keep *mollior* than to read *mollem de*, giving the line a spondaic beginning. In the first book over .61 of the lines begin with a dactyl. *Lotos ferit*, proposed for *motus serit* in II 41 f., is ingenious, but improbable. *Fervit opus* for *vertit opus* in II 775 seems very likely as an imitation of Vergil, G. IV 169. In II 784 Ellis proposes *captanti* for *cunctanti* (*tractanti*), and in IV 592 *peractum* for *profectum*. In both cases I prefer the MS reading. In IV 778 ff. he reads, with numerous changes from Jacob,

Inferius victae sidus Carthaginis arces
Et Libyam Aegyptique latus donataque rura
Cyrenes lacrimis radiato Scorpis arcu
Exuit.

interpreting *exuit*, to use his own words, "de nimio calore regionum Carthaginis, etc., propter quem qui ibi vivunt radiis icti Scorpionis exuunt se vestibus, nudis corporibus incedentes." One may grant *exuit* the sense of *strip*, but is it not rather bold to use it thus with *arces*? *Eruit*, the MS reading, has been defended by Breiter and may stand, although *irruit* would agree better with *tamen respectat*, which follows. Compare Avienus, II 546, where *urget* is followed by *respicit*. I cannot accept *pulpamenta* for *fundamenta* in V 133. I had thought of *fulcimenta*, comparing Phocas, Vita Vergilii, 27 (said of Terra):

Herbida supposuit puero fulmenta virescens—

but may not *fundamenta* be used in some such sense? Jacob writes *quondam alimenta*. *Quondam mella dedit* would give good sense and be in accordance with one form of the legend.

In V 245, where the Gemblacensis has

nec parce vina recepta
hauriet emisericis,

Ellis proposes *invergens*. Ennius wrote, Annales 448 (Baehrens), *olli crateris ex auratis hauserunt*, and it seems natural to find in *emisericis* a similar expression. Why not *e mistris* in the sense of *e crateris*, *mistrum* being formed from *misceo*, as *haustrum* from *haurio*? Compare also *mistarius*

(*mixtarius*) used by Lucilius. I am aware that Bentley ridiculed Turnebus for reading *e mystris* (= *μίστρον*; see *mistra* : *odia*, *mensura*. quoted by De Vit from Gloss. Pap.), and boldly read himself *hauriet e cratere*. I should prefer not to depart so far from the MSS. On pp. 211-16, in an Epimetrum, Ellis gives some conjectures found in a Roman edition of Manilius of the year 1510, which had been added by a scholar of the sixteenth century. Then follow, pp. 218-33, an interesting essay on the name of Manilius and, pp. 234-48, proposed emendations to the *Aratea* of Germanicus. Into these we cannot enter. The book as a whole is most suggestive and stimulating, and, as one would expect, full of recondite learning.

MINTON WARREN.

La Philologie Classique. Six conférences sur l'objet et la méthode des études supérieures relatives à l'antiquité grecque et romaine, par MAX BONNET, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Montpellier. Paris, C. Klincksieck, 1892. 224 pp.

The first of these 'Conférences' had already been published in the *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement* for May, 1891. All of them were delivered by Professor Bonnet on assuming the duties of his new chair at Montpellier. Although intended for a special audience, they have an interest for all who have to do with either the secondary or higher education. No attempt is made at a display of great learning, but the illustrations brought in incidentally show that the writer is acquainted with all the phases of his subject. The demands of modern life upon a university are fully recognized, yet it is strongly urged that the classics still offer the best foundation for later study. But the ideal classical teacher must be thoroughly and broadly trained, and himself be able to contribute to science, a thing which amateurs rarely do. The love of truth for him must be the highest end. An aesthetic appreciation of beautiful passages is not enough. His attention must not be confined to a narrow range of writers: he must know Greek and Latin literature and find nothing uninteresting. His vision must also be broadened by a knowledge of kindred disciplines—archaeology and mythology; history, both literary and political; phonetics; grammar and semantics; palaeography and epigraphy; nay, even numismatics and metrology. If he is interpreting a particular author, he must know all the literature bearing upon him, scattered though it be in journals, dissertations and reviews. This latter injunction may bring many teachers to the verge of despair, especially in this country, where it is so difficult to command all the previous literature. And in practice we fancy Prof. Bonnet would abate something from this demand. Whether independence of judgment is fostered by first reading all the previous literature may well be questioned. Some distinguished scholars seem to proceed on the very opposite principle. But that one ought to know where to look for things, and not repeat the discoveries and blunders of previous generations is self-evident. We have only glanced at this suggestive series of lectures. For the information of the reader, we subjoin their several headings:—I. Qu'est-ce que la